

Equality & Poverty Impact Assessment 00233 (Version 1)

SECTION ONE: ESSENTIAL INFORMATION

Service & Division:	Social Work Adult Services Community Care	Lead Officer Name:	Graham Haldane
		Team:	Locality Manager - Central
		Tel:	01324 501383
		Email:	graham.haldane@falkirk.gov.uk
Proposal:	<p>Closing Torwoodhall Care Home and relocation of current residents to alternative accommodation that meets their needs.</p> <p>Torwoodhall provides a residential service to residents who have enduring Mental Health conditions. Currently there are 14 permanent residents residing at the service.</p> <p>An initial report proposing closure was submitted to the IJB on 4/9/2020 and this was accepted. A further report has been submitted to the IJB for a decision. This meeting is due to be held on 20/11/2020.</p> <p>Torwoodhall is an older building over 3 floors. The building is in a poor state and would require significant upgrades with extensive costings. The design of the building will challenge the services ability to meet self isolating requirements of residents should there be multiple COVID cases. Residents relocating from this proposal will be given choices of services. These services are of more modern structure, have better facilities and are better equipped to deal with outbreaks of virus/infections, including Covid-19. Residents who are from out lying councils will be given the opportunity to relocate to services within the Falkirk area, in line with their wishes which will keep them local to familiar surroundings and facilities within the community. This will benefit families, in terms of their visiting as the services that</p>	Reference No:	

we would look to relocate residents to will be within close proximity to Torwood Hall. We do have one facility that residents may choose which may be in the Grangemouth area, but this is still fairly local and bus services are regular to the area from Falkirk and its outlying communities, and therefore impact will have minimal financially impact to families and residents.

Having looked at the nine characteristics, the facilities that we would offer, would have better disability access than Torwood Hall can provide. There would be no impact or detriment based on age, sex, ethnicity, sexual orientation and services within the partnership, respect the religious beliefs and faiths of all residents that receive a service in their establishments.

Residents and their families have been fully updated on the initial proposed report of the 4/9/20. These discussions took place in August/ September and involved speaking individually with residents and their families and stakeholders involved in their care. Some families asked to visit their loved ones and tell them personally to help their understanding which the service facilitated. Staff members also met with Senior Management and are fully updated on the proposal , Residents, their families and the staff team are aware of the further report being submitted for consideration by the IJB.

Meetings will be held with residents and their families to inform them if there is a decision to close, advocacy will be involved in these meetings and in individual residents meeting should the resident need this support or request it

Relocating residents to other services of their choice will not have a financial impact.

	<p>They will also receive emotional and care support from family, professional colleagues involved in their support plans and the staff team at Torwoodhall.</p> <p>If the decision is taken to close the service staff members will have the opportunity to support the residents in their transition to alternative accommodation and some may transfer to where residents choose to reside, providing consistency and continuity for residents.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

What is the Proposal?	Budget & Other Financial Decision	Policy (New or Change)	HR Policy & Practice	Change to Service Delivery / Service Design
	Yes	No	No	Yes
Who does the Proposal affect?	Service Users	Members of the Public	Employees	Job Applicants
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Other, please specify:				

Identify the main aims and projected outcome of this proposal (please add date of each update):	
15/12/2020	Additional information added

SECTION TWO: FINANCIAL INFORMATION

For budget changes ONLY please include information below:			Benchmark, e.g. Scottish Average
Current spend on this service (£'0000s)	Total:		
Reduction to this service budget (£'0000s)	Per Annum:		
Increase to this service budget (£'000s)	Per Annum:		
If this is a change to a charge or concession please complete.	Current Annual Income Total:		
	Expected Annual Income Total:		
If this is a budget decision, when will the saving be achieved?	Start Date:		
	End Date (if any):		

SECTION THREE: EVIDENCE	Please include any evidence or relevant information that has influenced the decisions contained in this EPIA. (This could include demographic profiles; audits; research; health needs assessments; national guidance or legislative requirements and how this relates to the protected characteristic groups.)
--------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

A - Quantitative Evidence	This is evidence which is numerical and should include the number people who use the service and the number of people from the protected characteristic groups who might be affected by changes to the service.
<p>TWH is a care home for 18 residents with severe and endure mental health illness. During 2020 it was realised that the building was not fit for purpose in preventing the spread of COVID19. It was further highlighted that the fabric and condition of the building required extensive renovation if at all to meet 21st century care standards. The building itself is of Edwardian era and there is no way of putting in lifts which could aid staff and residents with mobility issues or equipment needs.</p> <p>It was agreed at the September IJB and November IJB that TWH would be reviewed and subsequently a decision was taken to close the building and relocate all residents and staff.</p> <p>This piece of work was inline with Social Work statutory requirements to ensure all reviews and assessment of needs were carried out to enable and support the resident and families during this major change.</p>	

B - Qualitative Evidence	This is data which describes the effect or impact of a change on a group of people, e.g. some information provided as part of performance reporting.
Social - case studies; personal / group feedback / other	
<p>During the process of closure all residents were allocated a social worker to work with them and their families to identify other options available to them. The manger collated several video clips of our in-house provision to show residents what the other care home facilities were like. There was several individual meets which took place and the Home First Manager chaired these - this was to further reassure families and offer support and answer any queries in relation to the move. There was a host of partners involved in supporting these meetings these included advocacy, health practitioners, care inspectorate etc.</p> <p>When restrictions eased but again in partnership with Public Health residents were supported to visit there identified care homes and those visits were supported by staff from TWH.</p>	

Best Judgement:	
Has best judgement been used in place of data/research/evidence?	No

Who provided the best judgement and what was this based on?	Reports were submitted to the IJB for their scrutiny. Data was collated from H&S/PH regarding the potential spread of COVID19 and highlighted that during inspections the building was not equipped to be able to safely care for residents during these challenging times.
What gaps in data / information were identified?	
Is further research necessary?	No
If NO, please state why.	It was agreed by the board after a review was carried out from September 2020 to November 2020 when another report was submitted. The board made the decision to close TWH this commenced in January 2021.

SECTION FOUR: ENGAGEMENT

Engagement with individuals or organisations affected by the policy or proposal must take place

Has the proposal / policy / project been subject to engagement or consultation with service users taking into account their protected characteristics and socio-economic status?	Yes	
If YES, please state who was engagement with.	Engagement was held with the residents and families through reviews, consultations by teams meetings with families, health and Social work colleagues, the Care Inspectorate and advocacy services and staff members	
If NO engagement has been conducted, please state why.		
How was the engagement carried out?		What were the results from the engagement? Please list...
Focus Group	No	
Survey	No	
Display / Exhibitions	No	
User Panels	Yes	MDT meetings SW reviews and assessments consultation to HR and TU's
Public Event	No	
Other: please specify	Engagement were carried out through consultations with each individual resident, their families, their Health and Social Work workers and their advocates when appointed. Over the course of the process each resident had multiple meetings which included reviews, MDT meetings, an Awl meeting and discussions with their Keyworker at Torwoodhall responsible for their care. At these meeting residents were given the opportunity to make choices on where they wished to live. From these meetings an individual transition plan was devised to ensure the residents move was at their pace and as smooth as possible. Families were also consulted through teams meetings with the Home First Manager Nikki Havrey and Manager of TWH Hazel Brooks to agree individual plans and reassure them. Videos of other Care Homes and visits when possible were arranged. Staff members were fully involved in the process and consulted for their views at resident review meetings. They had multiple meetings with HR and the Home First Manager to discuss with them where they would be working in the future. Members of staff were given a number of choices and to list their preference. A plan was developed to enable staff members to move to Care Homes where Residents at TWH were choosing to move to. This allowed continuity of care for residents and staff members alike. Unions were also consulted throughout the process	

Has the proposal / policy/ project been reviewed / changed as a result of the engagement?	No
Have the results of the engagement been fed back to the consultees?	Yes
Is further engagement recommended?	No

SECTION FIVE: ASSESSING THE IMPACT

Equality Protected Characteristics: What will the impact of implementing this proposal be on people who share characteristics protected by the Equality Act 2010 or are likely to be affected by the proposal / policy / project? This section allows you to consider other impacts, e.g. poverty, health inequalities, community justice, carers etc.

Protected Characteristic	Neutral Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Please provide evidence of the impact on this protected characteristic.
Age	✓			All relocation of residents has been well supported and documented via various meetings and recorded on SWIS.
Disability	✓			N/A
Sex	✓			N/A
Ethnicity	✓			N/A
Religion / Belief / non-Belief	✓			N/A
Sexual Orientation	✓			N/A
Transgender	✓			N/A
Pregnancy / Maternity	✓			N/A
Marriage / Civil Partnership	✓			N/A
Poverty	✓			N/A
Other, health, community justice, carers etc.	✓			N/A
Risk (Identify other risks associated with this change)	Residents have chosen their new homes. Many have chosen other Falkirk Council Care Homes which provide the same service. These homes have a better fabric to their buildings and fit for purpose to meet current care standards. Residents have also had staff members who have been providing care to them			

	Evidence of Due Regard
Eliminate Unlawful Discrimination (harassment, victimisation and other prohibited conduct):	
Advance Equality of Opportunity:	All residents were fully supported and Advocacy was involved to ensure that the residents voice, choices and welfare was protected and their views and wishes fully explored.
Foster Good Relations (promoting understanding and reducing prejudice):	working collaboratively with all our partners to promote and reduce prejudice. This included working with the CPN and further mental health team to ensure good outcomes for individual residents and their families.

SECTION SIX: PARTNERS / OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

Which sectors are likely to have an interest in or be affected by the proposal / policy / project?		Describe the interest / affect.
Business	No	
Councils	Yes	TWH is a council run Care Home. There were two residents who were from out of area and one of the residents has chosen to return to their birth area
Education Sector	No	
Fire	Yes	The Fire Service will need to be made aware when there are no residents and staff in the building
NHS	Yes	NH colleagues who were involved with individual residents were involved in assisting with the closure of TWH.
Integration Joint Board	Yes	The IJB have been consulted and approved the work currently being done and will continue to be updated as it progresses
Police	No	
Third Sector	No	
Other(s): please list and describe the nature of the relationship / impact.	Falkirk Councils Facilities have been informed as once the residents and Staff team have relocated to their new home and work place the building will require to be closed	

SECTION SEVEN: ACTION PLANNING

Mitigating Actions: If you have identified impacts on protected characteristic groups in Section 5 please summarise these in the table below detailing the actions you are taking to mitigate or support this impact. If you are not taking any action to support or mitigate the impact you should complete the No Mitigating Actions section below instead.

Identified Impact	To Who	Action(s)	Lead Officer	Evaluation and Review Date	Strategic Reference to Corporate Plan / Service Plan / Quality Outcomes

No Mitigating Actions

Please explain why you do not need to take any action to mitigate or support the impact of your proposals.

Residents have chosen their new homes and have now moved and settled well. Many have chosen other Falkirk Council Care Homes which provide the same service. These homes have a better fabric to their buildings and fit for purpose to meet current care standards.

Are actions being reported to Members?

No

If yes when and how ?

SECTION EIGHT: ASSESSMENT OUTCOME

Only one of following statements best matches your assessment of this proposal / policy / project. Please select one and provide your reasons.

No major change required	Yes	The IJB received two reports proposing TWH closure which was approved. A consultation process has taken place with all relevant parties and a plan in place to close the service with the agreement of everyone involved in the consultation process. Meetings have taken place and agreed outcomes implemented both individual and strategic
The proposal has to be adjusted to reduce impact on protected characteristic groups	No	
Continue with the proposal but it is not possible to remove all the risk to protected characteristic groups	No	
Stop the proposal as it is potentially in breach of equality legislation	No	

SECTION NINE: LEAD OFFICER SIGN OFF

Lead Officer:

Signature:	Nikki Harvey	Date:	26/04/2021
------------	--------------	-------	------------

SECTION TEN: EPIA TASK GROUP ONLY

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF EPIA: Has the EPIA demonstrated the use of data, appropriate engagement, identified mitigating actions as well as ownership and appropriate review of actions to confidently demonstrate compliance with the general and public sector equality duties?		Yes
ASSESSMENT FINDINGS If YES, use this box to highlight evidence in support of the assessment of the EPIA If NO, use this box to highlight actions needed to improve the EPIA	There was consultations carried out with all care home residents and their families ahead of any decision which was made by the IJB. Section 1 describes in detail the consultation work completed before during and after any decision was made and all relevant parties were kept informed at each stage of the process. The support and information made available to residents and their families is well documented in section 3 and as stated all work was in line with legal and statutory requirements.	
Where adverse impact on diverse communities has been identified and it is intended to continue with the proposal / policy / project, has justification for continuing <u>without making changes been made</u>?	Yes	If YES, please describe: This is not applicable as no impact on diverse communities has been identified in this assessment.

LEVEL OF IMPACT: The EPIA Task Group has agreed the following level of impact on the protected characteristic groups highlighted within the EPIA

LEVEL		COMMENTS
HIGH	Yes	The care home residents and their families would be impacted highly from the closure of Torwoodhall Care Home - especially the longer term residents. However meeting with each individual regularly and assessing their care needs and identifying appropriate continuing care was demonstrated in having healthcare professionals, legal professionals and other partners involved in supporting these meetings.
MEDIUM	No	
LOW	No	

SECTION ELEVEN: CHIEF OFFICER SIGN OFF

Director / Head of Service:

Signature:	Martin David Thom	Date:	23/02/2023
------------	-------------------	-------	------------